Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

[Notes supplementary to the Johns Hopkins University
Studies in Historical and Political Science—No. 3.]

THE ENCOURAGEMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION.

AN ADDRESS BY HERBERT B. ADAMS, PH. D., ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR
OF HISTORY IN THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

On Commemoration Day of the University,

FEBRUARY 22, 1889.

I.

The choice of the twenty-second of February for the Founder's Day of the John Hopkins University will always be recognized as singularly appropriate. Historic associations, at once local and national, determined the choice.

A local institution, with a national character, was planted in Baltimore by our President and Board of Trustees in the centennial year of the American Republic. Assembled here under the very shadow of Washington's monument, at a time when the whole country is preparing to celebrate the inauguration of the first and of the twenty-third President of these United States, we cannot but rejoice that the first President of our Baltimore University was inaugurated on the birthday of the Father of our Country.

On this national holiday, when the general government is approaching its hundredth year, on this happy anniversary when our fair *Academia* is just entering her teens,—

“How tall among her sisters, and how fair;
How grave beyond her youth, yet debonaire
As dawn,” *

it is fitting that loyal Hopkinsians should recognize their double debt of gratitude, on the one hand, to our generous local founder; and, on the other, to George Washington, Father of the National Idea in University Education.

It is a fact not generally known that the Father of his Country, before he became President of the United States, was the president of a Virginia college. Indeed, Washington would never have had a fair chance in public life if, as a young man of seventeen, he had not passed a satisfactory exam-

* From Sidney Lanier's Ode to the Johns Hopkins University, read by the Author in Hopkins Hall, February 23, 1880.

ination in surveying before the faculty of William and Mary College. Here, for merit, he was appointed to his first civic office as a county surveyor. This office gave him a thorough acquaintance with the western frontier of Virginia, and prepared the way for his subsequent successes in military and civil life. When Washington was chosen to the office of chancellor of William and Mary College, succeeding the Bishop of London in that educational honor, he assured the Board of Trustees of his firm confidence "in their strenuous efforts for placing the system of education on such a basis as will render it the most beneficial to the State and the republic of letters, as well as to the more extensive interests of humanity and religion." Washington was always the friend of William and Mary College, his *alma mater*. Without forgetting local institutions in Virginia, he advanced during his eight years presidency of the United States to what may be called the National Idea in University Education. From that idea Baltimore to-day can derive encouragement and inspiration.

Washington's grand thought of a National University, based upon individual endowment, may be found in many of his writings, but the clearest and strongest statement occurs in his last will and testament. There he employed the following significant language: "It has been my ardent wish to see a plan devised on a liberal scale, which would have a tendency to spread systematic ideas through all parts of this rising empire, thereby to do away local attachments and State prejudices, as far as the nature of things would, or indeed ought to admit, from our national councils. Looking anxiously forward to the accomplishment of so desirable an object as this is, in my estimation, my mind has not been able to contemplate any plan more likely to effect the measure than the establishment of a *University* in a central part of the United States, to which the youths of fortune and talents from all parts thereof may be sent for the completion of their education, in all branches of polite literature, in arts and sciences, in acquiring knowledge in the principles of politics and good government, and, as a matter of infinite importance in my judgment, by associating with each other, and forming friendships in juvenile years, be enabled to free themselves in a proper degree from those local prejudices and habitual jealousies which have just been mentioned, and which, when carried to excess, are never-failing sources of disquietude to the public mind, and pregnant of mischievous consequences to this country. Under these impressions, so fully dilated, I give and bequeath, in perpetuity, the fifty shares which I hold in the Potomac Company, . . . towards the endowment of a university, to be established within the limits of the District of Columbia, under the auspices of the general government, if that government should incline to extend a favoring hand towards it."

Here was the individual foundation of a National University. Here was the first suggestion of that noble line of public policy subsequently adopted in 1846 by our general government in relation to the Smithsonian Institution. The will of James Smithson, of England, made in 1826, was "to

found at Washington, under the name of the Smithsonian Institution, an establishment for the increase and diffusion of knowledge among men." A simpler educational bequest, with such far-reaching results, was never before made. Whether James Smithson was influenced to this foundation by the example of Washington is a curious problem. Smithson's original bequest, amounting to something over \$500,000, was accepted by Congress for the purpose designated, and was placed in the treasury of the United States, where by good administration and small additional legacies (in two cases from other individuals) the sum has increased to over \$700,000. Besides this, the Smithsonian Institution now has a library equal in value to the original endowment, and acquired by the simple process of government exchanges; and it owns buildings equal in value to more than half the original endowment. During the past year, as shown by the Secretary's report, the institution was "charged by Congress with the care and disbursement of sundry appropriations," * amounting to \$220,000. The National Museum is under the direction of the Secretary of the Smithsonian, and the government appropriations to that museum, since its foundation, aggregate nearly two million dollars. The existence and ever-increasing prosperity of the Smithsonian Institution are standing proofs that private foundations may receive the fostering care of government without injurious results. Independent administration of scientific institutions may coexist with State aid. It is a remarkable testimony to the wisdom of George Washington's original idea, that Andrew D. White, who, when president of Cornell University, happily combined private endowments and government land-grants, lately suggested in *The Forum*,† the thought of a National University upon individual foundations. This thought is a century old, but it remains to this day the grandest thought in American educational history.

George Washington, like James Smithson, placed a private bequest, so that the general government might extend to it "a favoring hand;" but in those early days Congress had no conception of the duties of government towards education and science, although attention was repeatedly called to these subjects by enlightened executives like Thomas Jefferson, "Father of the University of Virginia," James Madison, James Monroe and John Quincy Adams. It took Congress ten years to establish the Smithsonian Institution after the bequest had been accepted and the money received. Unfortunately George Washington's Potomac stock never paid but one dividend, and there was no pressure in those days towards educational appropriations from an ever-increasing surplus. The affairs of the Potomac Company were finally merged in the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal, which became a profitable enterprise, and endures to this day. What became of George Washington's "consolidated stock" of that period, history does not record. Jared Sparks, Washington's biographer, thought the stock was

* Report of Samuel P. Langley, Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, 1887-88, p. 7.

† *The Forum*, February, 1889.

"held in trust" by the new company for the destined university. There is probably little danger that it will ever be thrown upon the market in a solid block by the treasury of the United States, to which the stock legally belongs, unless the present surplus should suddenly vanish in armored ships and coast defences, and the general government be forced to realize upon its assets for the expenses of the next administration.

George Washington's educational schemes were by no means visionary. His stock in the James River Company, which like the Potomac Company, he had helped to organize, actually became productive and was by him presented to Liberty Hall Academy, now Washington and Lee University, at Lexington, Virginia, where General Lee died and was buried, having served his native state, as did George Washington, in the capacity of a college president. Washington raised Liberty Hall Academy to what he called "a seminary of learning upon an enlarged plan, but not coming up to the full idea of University." He meant to make it one of the three Virginia supporters of the University at Washington. Liberty Hall, or Washington College, his own William and Mary, and Hampden-Sidney, were all to be state pillars of a national temple of learning.

Washington's dream of great University, rising grandly upon the Maryland bank of the Potomac, remained a dream for three quarters of a century. But there is nothing more real or persistent than the dreams of great men, whether statesmen like Baron vom Stein, or poets like Dante and Petrarch, or prophets like Savonarola, or thinkers like St. Thomas Aquinas, the Fathers of the Church and of Greek philosophy. States are overthrown; literatures are lost; temples are destroyed; systems of thought are shattered to pieces like the statues of Pheidias; but somehow truth and beauty, art and architecture, forms of poetry, ideals of liberty and government, of sound learning and of the education of youth, these immortal dreams are revived from age to age and take concrete shape before the very eyes of successive generations.

The idea of university education in the arts and sciences is as old as the schools of Greek philosophy. The idea was perpetuated at Alexandria, Rome, and Athens under the emperors. It endured at Constantinople and Ravenna. It was revived at Bologna, Paris, Prague, Heidelberg, Oxford and Cambridge under varying auspices, whether of city, church, or state; and was sustained by the munificence of merchants, princes, prelates, kings and queens. Ideas of higher education were transmitted to a new world by Englishmen who believed in an educated ministry and who would not suffer learning to perish in the wilderness. The collegiate foundations laid by John Harvard in Massachusetts and Commissary Blair in Virginia were the historic models for many similar institutions, north and south. George Washington, the chancellor of William and Mary, when he became president of a federal republic, caught up, in the capital of a westward moving empire, the old university idea and gave it national scope. There upon the Potomac he proposed to found a National University, drawing its economic

life from the great artery of commerce, which connects the Atlantic seaboard and the Great West. As early as 1770 Washington described this Potomac route as "the channel of the extensive and valuable trade of a rising empire."

Was it not in some measure an historic, although an unconscious, fulfilment of that old dream of Washington when, a hundred years later, Johns Hopkins determined to establish upon the Maryland side of the Potomac a university with an economic tributary in the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad, which follows the very windings of that ancient channel of commerce? Forms of endowment may change, but university ideas endure. They are the common historic inheritance of every enlightened age and of every liberal mind; but their large fulfilment requires a breadth of foundation and a range of vision reaching beyond mere locality. Universities that deserve the name have always been something more than local or provincial institutions. Since the days when Roman youth frequented the schools of Grecian philosophy, since the time when ultramontanes and cismontanes congregated at Bologna, since students organized by nations at Paris, Prague, and Heidelberg, since Northern Scots fought Southern Englishmen at Oxford, university-life has been something even more than national. It has been international and cosmopolitan. Though always locally established and locally maintained, universities are beacon lights among the nations, commanding wide horizons of sea and shore, catching all the winds that blow and all the sun that shines, attracting, like the great light-house of Ptolemy Philadelphus on the Island of Pharos, sailors from distant lands to Alexandrine havens, or speeding the outward voyager.

Doubtless Johns Hopkins, like George Washington, had no very definite conception concerning the world-wide relations of a great modern university; but he saw as clearly as did the Father of his Country that the beneficent influence of higher education, if properly endowed, must reach far beyond the limits of a single state. His bump of locality was larger than that of most founders. He made special provision that a part of the benefits of his institution should be extended over at least three great American Commonwealths—Maryland, Virginia, and North Carolina, from which states his first wealth as a merchant had been drawn. But Johns Hopkins was a railroad-king as well as a merchant-prince. He had economic interests, far and wide, upon land and sea. His wealth came from western as well as southern connections. It came with every train from the coal regions of Western Maryland and Virginia, with every cargo of wheat and corn from the grain belts beyond the Ohio. Johns Hopkins knew well that a great university, like a great railroad, must have its distant feeders, its through routes, and outward connections, as well as its local accommodations and way stations. What a joy it would have been to that man of large enterprise and of broad views to hear that the University which bears his name is to-day honored and respected in every European country, in India, China, and Japan; that our university publications and scientific exchanges belt the globe; that Baltimore offers opportunities for advanced instruction,

which attract students not only from the home-states of Maryland, Virginia, and North Carolina, but from every section of these happily Reunited States. Practical business man that he was, *he* would have recognized with the quick instinct of a far-seeing mind and with the shrewd sagacity of a student of railroad reports, the significance of the following statistics, patiently gathered by a student who abandoned even a government office in the treasury department of the United States for the sake of studying at the Johns Hopkins University.

The Baltimore public has been accustomed to see or hear some new thing every year with regard to the number of students from this city, from Maryland, Japan, and each individual State of the American Union. The following facts represent a novel grouping of students according to the great sections of country from which they come. There have been some misapprehensions in our community concerning the region benefited by this university. Our new arrangement of statistics shows that during the present year there have been studying at this institution 98 graduates from the South, 47 from the West, 26 from the Middle States, 18 from New England. It is plain that this university is drawing college men from the same sources as those from which John Hopkins drew his wealth, namely: from the South and West. In the undergraduate department there are now 139 students from the South; 18 from the West; 14 from the Middle States; and 4 from New England. Plainly, most of "our boys" come from the same sections of country as our graduates. The sum total of men from the South is 237; from the West, 65; from the Middle States, 40; from New England, 22. In short the South has more than three and one-half times as many representatives as the West; six times as many as the Middle States, and more than ten times the number from New England. The total number from all the other States combined is nearly doubled by the South. About one half of our entire student public comes from the State of Maryland. Considerably more than one-half comes from the three Southern States which Johns Hopkins wished especially to benefit. From this brief review of statistical facts, four points are clear: First, the intent of our founder has been realized; Second, the South and the West are chief sources of our student-supply; Third, in these directions are the lines of least resistance and greatest influence for the Johns Hopkins University; Fourth, one-half of our student public comes from other States than Maryland, a fact indicating that the local idea is happily balanced by the national idea.

There are pleasing evidences of internationality in the life and influence of the Johns Hopkins University. Some of our professors came hither from England and Germany, as did the professors whom Thomas Jefferson introduced into the University of Virginia. Almost all the members of our faculty have studied at one time or another in European institutions. The annual register for 1888 shows twelve students from Canada, seven from Japan, and one representative from each of the following countries: China, England, Germany, Mexico, Italy and Russia. Here is a New

Year's greeting to the president of the university from four of our Japanese graduates now holding educational posts in their native country: "Mr. Sato being in town [*i. e.*, Tokio, the capital of the Japanese Empire], we four Johns Hopkins University men had a dinner together, and talked over the good times we had in Baltimore. We thought we would send greetings to you and remind you that in this distant East there are some who remember J. H. U. with gratitude and affection, and who wish every success to the university. Signed, Kuhara, Mitsukuri, Sato and Motora." Mitsukuri is professor of biology in the University of Tokio, and Sato is acting president of his *alma mater*, the Imperial College at Sapporo, and at the same time he is confidential secretary of the governor of the Province of Hokkaido. From the local government board of that province there came this very year two officials to study American local institutions at the Johns Hopkins University. This mission was at the instance of Dr. Sato, who, when he was in Baltimore, wrote a doctor's thesis upon the "History of the Land Question in the United States,"* a monograph, which in the opinion of a scholarly Senator in Washington, contains the best existing account of the famous Ordinance of 1787, for the government of the old Northwest Territory. Since Webster's famous debate with Hayne of South Carolina, that Ordinance has been the subject of historic dispute. When Japanese contribute to the enlightenment of American statesmen, upon American history, let us not begrudge foreigners a share in Baltimore academic training. They pay for the privilege in honest work or good money, and set all American students a good example in not asking something for nothing.

What becomes of our native born, when they graduate from the Johns Hopkins? Have they as good a record as the Japanese? As far as heard from, none of our American graduates have become college presidents; but, like the great American people, we have a good deal of presidential material constantly on hand, and can supply demands on short notice. When Clark University, up there on the Massachusetts and New Hampshire frontier, wanted an administrative head, the Johns Hopkins promptly sent one of its best professors for the important office. That professor, when he set out upon his missionary undertaking, like Augustine when he set out to convert the Anglo-Saxons, selected a little band of men from his own cloister,—devoted men, who were willing to take their lives in their hands and go far hence among those fierce college-tribes of New England.

The blood of martyrs is the seed of the Church. In the interests of science and the higher education, the Johns Hopkins University is ready at any time to throw its best men to the lions—to those young lions, the colleges and universities that are roaring with hunger in every State amphitheatre. Changing this bloody metaphor to a more humane and pleasing form, we might liken the attitude of this university towards all academic suitors, to that of a benignant father of a large family of girls in one of those over-

* Johns Hopkins University Studies, vol. IV, Nos. 7-8-9.

populated, feminine towns of Massachusetts, towards a courageous young man who asked the privilege of marrying one of the numerous daughters: "Take her, my son! take her! God bless you! *Do you know who wants another?*" This is a true story, taken not from town records, but from family traditions in a Puritan household, where nobody is supposed to have ever smiled except at weddings and on Thanksgiving Day.

Seriously, sympathetic friends, such is the conscious self-sacrifice of the Johns Hopkins University. Our dear *alma mater* is willing to give away her sons (and daughters, if she had them) at any time for their own best good and for the good of the country. When, therefore, you read in the newspapers that *another* Johns Hopkins "professor" has been called away (it may be noted that Hopkins graduates are sometimes styled "professors" even before they receive a call), you should greet the announcement with joy and not with grief. Baltimore might as well weep over the latest "engagement" in society circles, as to pity the Hopkins for losing her men. What are we here for if not to train up men of learning, science and letters; to establish an academic exchange, a university clearing-house? What better policy could there be than to graduate professors as college-presidents, and students as professors?

Now let us consider a few facts illustrating the fate of some of our Hopkins' graduates. The librarian of the historical department, aided by our excellent statistician, has prepared an object lesson for the encouragement of friends of higher education in Baltimore. Upon the centennial map of the United States, he has fastened lines of white tape, extending from our Baltimore university-centre in five directions, north, south, south-west, west, and north-west. He has boxed the educational compass. Upon those white lines you will see stars; and they are of various magnitudes. There is a double star over the neighboring cities of Baltimore and Washington, like Castor and Pollux, the great twin brethren, the *gemini* in the American University zodiac,—

"So like they were, no mortal
Might one from other know;
White as snow their armor was,
Their steeds were white as snow.

* * * * *

"Safe comes the ship to haven,
Through billows and through gales,
If once the great Twin Brethren
Sit shining on the sails."

From this brilliant *stella duplex*, this double beacon-light, whose rays shine over land and sea, a long belt of pure white light reaches upward to the New England polar star. Clark University is at present snowed under, just below the lowest ray of the great white planet which represents Hopkins academic influence in the remote North. The star is numbered 12. That means there are twelve Hopkins missionaries going up and down in snow shoes, preaching their academic gospel in those foreign parts. Four are

now settled on Massachusetts Bay, in such important posts as Harvard University and the Institute of Technology. Two are teaching history and economics at Providence Plantations, where Roger Williams took refuge from his Massachusetts brethren in former days. Four more are at Middletown, Connecticut; and others are down in Maine. New England once colonized the South with school-teachers from those over-populated towns. Baltimore is now sending a few pious monks, with St. Stanislaus Hall, to return the compliment. In going northward, some of our men, four in number, got off at way stations in New Jersey. Thirteen penetrated as far as New York.

Returning to Baltimore, we observe 43 men waiting about the corner of Little Ross and Howard Streets for college presidencies, university professorships, positions in Harrison's cabinet or in the United States treasury. Going over to Washington, we note that ten Hopkins men have already established themselves as teachers or clerks in the government service. Pushing southward, we see a white line of Hopkins colonial influence extending from Maryland to Florida. Southwestward and northwestward from Baltimore extend other lines of university colonists, stopping at Austin, Texas, and at Portland, Oregon, where a solitary Hopkinsian is shining like a lone star. Along the white belt the numbered stars represent the number of Hopkins professors and professional men in the various states. Our graduates are particularly numerous in the Northwest. The white star line westward is a through route from Baltimore and Washington to the Pacific coast. It follows, in general, that old Potomac route, the line of the National Road and of the Baltimore and Ohio, the westward-moving centre of population and the Central and Union Pacific. It crosses the continent to the University of California, where we have three men. By this route our Japanese friends return to their own country and pass beyond our stellar horizon. By this route Hopkins men, like Professors Royce and Levermore, who went out from Baltimore to the University of California, were called back, the first to Harvard, the second to the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. By this route a college lad came from Boulder, Colorado, to the Johns Hopkins University, where he was fitted for a classical professorship, first in Smith College for women in Massachusetts, then in Bowdoin College for men in Maine. Such are the promenades of Hopkins graduates along these great avenues of travel from east to west and west to east.

The effect of this system of university-exchange upon the country at large is beyond estimate. We see westerners called eastward to college positions; northerners called southwards; and southerners called northwards. A North Carolinian, trained at the University of Virginia, and afterwards at the Johns Hopkins, is appointed professor of history and politics in a Connecticut university, after teaching the same subjects to young ladies at Bryn Mawr. We see a graduate of a Massachusetts College, who took his doctor's degree in Baltimore, lecturing in various colleges throughout the west and finally settling at Vanderbilt University, in Tennessee, whence he makes a

weekly trip to lecture in St. Louis. We see a graduate of Harvard University becoming one of our fellows in Greek, then travelling in Europe upon a Harvard fellowship, returning to Cambridge as an instructor, then called to be a professor of Greek in Bowdoin College, thence called to the University of Virginia, to a chair once occupied by our own Professor Gildersleeve. We see our first Doctor of Philosophy in the historical department lecturing at Michigan, Cornell, and Johns Hopkins Universities, all in one year, then holding the chair of economics in two institutions at once, one east and one west, with a half year in each. We see him now in full charge of a department at the University of Michigan and at the same time directing the statistical work of a bureau of forty clerks for the Interstate Commerce Commission at Washington. These are simply representative facts. They might be paralleled by dozens of examples in the history of our various departments of instruction.

What do these facts mean? They mean that the President and Trustees of the Johns Hopkins University have established here a national university upon a local and individual foundation. They have realized the historic idea of George Washington, whose birth-day they wisely chose for their Founder's Day. They have carried out Johns Hopkins' Will in a spirit of large philanthropy, transcending the boundaries of a single state and yet conserving the home interests of Baltimore and of the State of Maryland. Whether consciously or unconsciously, they have also realized, in every essential detail, the ideal purposes set forth in Washington's last will and testament: *They have devised a plan upon a liberal scale, which has a tendency to spread systematic ideas through all parts of this rising empire. They have established a university in this central part of the United States whither young men are coming from all parts of the country to complete their education in all branches of polite literature, in the arts and sciences, in the principles of politics and good government. By friendship and associations formed here in Baltimore, these young men are learning to free themselves from local prejudices and sectional jealousy.* These phrases from Washington are no longer mere expressions of hope; they are the language of history.

The Johns Hopkins University has by no means accomplished its mission. Its record is full of accomplished facts, but facts are only stepping stones to higher things. "*What you do,*" Hopkinsians, "*still betters what is done.*" All history is but the striving of man towards a better future. Our academic course thus far has been a constant struggle with difficulties and a steady advance along the line. We are entering now upon the grandest campaign in our university career. It is not a struggle for existence, like that carried on by Thomas Jefferson for fifty years in the interest of university education in Virginia, until at last, at the age of four score, that grand old champion of liberty and learning won the confidence of democracy, and established an institution which has withstood the shocks of war and reconstruction. It is not a forlorn hope, like that led for many years by Col. Ewell, the president of William and Mary College, when the faculty and

the students had all departed and he was left alone with the chapel bell and a negro servant, until at last one fine morning a year ago the legislature of Virginia awoke from its long indifference and voted an appropriation of ten thousand dollars, which set the old college bell to ringing again; and a Johns Hopkins man promptly went down to Williamsburg and took the chair of history.

Our struggle is for nobler victories than any hitherto won. We are to grapple with existing facts and, by good generalship, turn them into favoring conditions for still greater success. As George Washington said to the trustees of William and Mary, we believe in the efforts of our authorities "*for placing this system of education on such a basis as will render it the most beneficial to the State and the republic of letters, as well as the more extensive interests of humanity and religion.*"

II.

How can the foundations of a National University, resting upon individual endowment, be further strengthened? Simply by extension and more endowments of the same sort. A great university grows as a great city grows, by the individual association of property investments along avenues already opened. Watch the present process of Baltimore extension beyond its former "boundary," and you will realize how in time the Johns Hopkins University *may* extend beyond its original walls and possibly reach as far as Clifton with some of its buildings. There are men who dream of founding towns and universities apart from existing centres of population and capital; but he is a wise founder who, like George Peabody, Johns Hopkins, or Enoch Pratt, recognizes the vantage ground of a noble city, and plants there institutions which will work together through coming ages. The principle holds with reference to individual endowments for the higher education. They always accomplish the most good when they are connected with some central foundation which gives them at once stability, unity and individuality, as in the associated institutions of a large city.

Extension by private philanthropy is the manifest destiny of the Johns Hopkins University. There will perhaps be the individual endowment of a college; perhaps of a university library, bearing the name of the giver, like the Andrew D. White Library at Cornell University; of a laboratory, a museum, or an observatory like those at Harvard or at the University of Virginia. Some day we ought to have an art gallery like that at Yale. What is most needed, however, is a central academic building and library to shelter fitly the "Fair Humanities,"—the studies of ancient and modern literature; philosophy and ethics; history, politics, and social science. Baltimore, in the course of time, will have as many foundations, bearing individual names, as there are now in the older institutions of the country. Glance through the catalogues of Harvard, Yale, Princeton, or the University of Virginia, and see the great host of private bequests, some large, some small, but all of them carefully guarded and applied to specific objects,

such as the increase of the library or the support of scholarships and fellowships. There may be as much individuality in a great university establishment as there is in a street or a city bearing a great man's name, like *Washington Place* or *Baltimore*. Probably the families living in the immediate neighborhood of Washington Monument do not regard the individuality of their own houses as lost to view in the general unity and beauty of this noble square with its towering Campanile, its Peabody Institute, its fountains and bronze statues, its Walters' Gallery, and its Mt. Vernon Church.

This is an era of educational endowment upon a generous scale. The most recent published report of Colonel Dawson, the Commissioner of Education, shows that the sum total of noteworthy educational gifts during the year 1886-7 was nearly five million dollars. More than two-thirds of the entire amount were distributed among nine institutions, four of them collegiate, one academic, three professional, and one technical. The institution most highly favored was Harvard University, which received from individual sources nearly a million dollars. From one man came a legacy of \$630,000. Our nearer neighbor Haverford College, supported by the Society of Friends, received \$700,000 in one bequest. Of the 209 gifts recorded by the Commissioner of Education, 25 represent \$50,000 or more; 72 were sums between \$5,000 and \$49,000; and 112 were sums less than \$5,000. The most striking fact in all this record of philanthropy is that such a large proportion of the entire amount, fully two-thirds, was given to higher education. The year 1888 is richer than 1887 in individual bounty to institutions of learning. Nearly ten millions were given by three persons for the encouragement of manual training, etc., but there are rumors of even larger benefactions for university endowment. The collective returns for 1888 are not yet published, but it is certain that the past year will surpass any hitherto recorded in the annals of American education.

Whatever forms modern philanthropy may take, one thing is certain, universities are not likely to be forgotten. At the founding of the new Catholic University in Washington, Bishop Spalding said that a university "is an institution which, better than anything else, symbolizes the aim and tendencies of modern life." Will not broad-minded people in Baltimore recognize the truth of this statement and strengthen existing foundations? Senator Hoar, at the laying of the corner stone of the new Clark University, said "The University is the bright consummate flower of democracy." Will not American patriots cultivate endowments made by the generosity of sons of the people? Are the noble gifts of Johns Hopkins for the advancement of learning and the relief of suffering likely to be forgotten by present or future generations? All history testifies to the gradual up-building of universities by individual benefactions. The development of European and American colleges is one long record of private philanthropy. It is not possible that this generous and appreciative city of Baltimore, this State of Maryland, will fail to encourage and develop an

institution which already in thirteen years has educated 770 of its choicest youth, many of whom are now conspicuous for their good citizenship and active labors in behalf of this community. This City of Baltimore surely contains individuals with discernment enough to recognize accomplished facts and with generosity and wisdom enough to encourage higher education in Maryland in ways that will do the most good.

While the Johns Hopkins University undoubtedly has most to expect from private philanthropy, like that which has already built up the city, it is not beyond the bounds of possibility to hope that the State of Maryland may some day extend to our institution what George Washington modestly called a "favoring hand." At present this state, by the exercise of its taxing power, takes from the Johns Hopkins the sum of nearly \$11,000 and from the Johns Hopkins Hospital the sum of \$33,000 a year. From our original patrimony Baltimore County took a collateral inheritance tax of \$36,000. The power to tax is sometimes called the power to destroy. Surely Maryland would not willingly subvert or impair educational foundations that were laid for the benefit of her own sons and citizens without reference to creed or nationality. The Baltimore public and the Baltimore press only need to consider fairly the facts and principles in the case to become, if necessary, the champions of this University in the state legislature.

The exemption of college property, even the property of professors, from taxation was well-nigh the universal custom in the English colonies of North America. To this day, Maryland exempts from taxation all buildings, furniture, equipments, and libraries of incorporated educational or literary institutions, with the land appertaining to them—in other words, all *unproductive* property actually in use for educational purposes. This principle of exempting the property of institutions of learning is so thoroughly embedded in the constitutional, statutory, and customary law of almost every state in the American Union that such exemption may be recognized, like the principles of Roman Law, as sovereign common sense. But some American states go much farther and exempt the *productive* property of colleges and universities, their savings and investments, the income of which is applied to educational objects. The personal property and real estate belonging to educational institutions are exempt from taxation in each of the following states: Maine, Vermont, Rhode Island, Virginia, Kentucky, Kansas, Louisiana, and Nebraska, and probably in others whose statutory laws permit exemption but whose customs and policy vary.

Exemption from taxation is a manifest duty which the State of Maryland owes to an institution which is now using all the income from its productive capital, as well as its buildings, books, and apparatus, for the higher education of Maryland youth. Indeed, one might go farther and say that the Johns Hopkins is doing for Maryland what most states endeavor to secure by large annual appropriations. This institution is to-day discharging the functions of a State University and is paying for the privilege of providing what is usually regarded as the duty of the state to provide.

The encouragement of higher education by government aid, in one form or another, has been a recognized principle of public policy in every enlightened state, whether ancient or modern. Older than the recognition of popular education as a public duty was the endowment of colleges and universities at public expense for the education of men who were to serve church or state. It is a mistake to think that the foundation of institutions by princes or prelates was a purely private matter. The money or the land always came from the people in one form or another, and the benefit of endowment returned to the people sooner or later. Popular education is the historic outgrowth of the higher education in every civilized country, and those countries which have done most for universities have the best schools for the people. It is an error to suppose that endowment of the higher learning is confined to Roman and German emperors, French and English kings. Crowned and uncrowned Republics have pursued the same public policy. Indeed, the liberality of government towards art and science always increases with the progress of liberal ideas, even in monarchical countries like Germany where, since the introduction of parliamentary government, appropriations for university education have greatly increased. The total cost of maintaining the Prussian universities, as shown by the reports of our Commissioner of Education, is about two million dollars a year. Only about nine per cent. of this enormous outlay is met by tuition fees. The state contributes all the rest in endowments and appropriations. Prussia now gives to her universities more than twice as much as she did before the Franco-Prussian war, as shown by the report of our commissioner at the Paris Exposition in 1867. In that year France gave her faculties of higher instruction only \$765,764. After the overthrow of the second empire, popular appropriations for higher education greatly increased. The budget for 1888 shows that France now appropriates for college and university faculties \$2,330,000 a year, more than three times the amount granted under Louis Napoleon. Despotism is never so favorable to the highest interests of education as is popular government. Louis XIV and Frederick the Great, according to the authority of Roscher, the political economist, regarded universities, like custom houses, as sources of revenue, for the maintenance of absolute forms of government. The world is growing weary of royal munificence when exercised at the people's expense, with royal grants based upon popular benevolence and redounding to the glory and profit of the prince rather than to the folk upholding his throne. Since the introduction of constitutional government into European states, representatives of the people are taking the power of educational endowment and subsidy into their own hands and right royally do they discharge their duty. The little Republic of Switzerland, with a population of only three millions, supports four state universities, having altogether more than three hundred instructors. Its cantons, corresponding upon a small scale to our states, expend over \$300,000 a year upon the higher education. The Federal Government of Switzerland appropriated, in 1887, \$115,000 to the

polytechnicum and \$56,000 in subsidies to cantonal schools, industrial and agricultural; besides bestowing regularly \$10,000 a year for the encouragement of Swiss art. The aggregate revenues of the colleges of Oxford, based upon innumerable historic endowments, public and private, now amount to fully two million dollars a year. The income of the Cambridge College endowments amounts to quite as much. But all this, it may be said, represents the policy of foreign lands. Let us look at home and see what is done in our own American commonwealths.

Maryland began her educational history by paying a tobacco tax for the support of William and Mary College. This colonial generosity to another State has an historic parallel in the appropriation of a township of land by Vermont for the encouragement of Dartmouth College in the State of New Hampshire, and in the corn that was sent from New Haven to the support of young Harvard. In colonial days Maryland had her county schools, some of them classical, like King William's School at Annapolis. All were founded by authority of the Colonial Government and supported by aid from the public treasury. The principle of State aid to higher education runs throughout the entire history of both State and Colony.

The development of Maryland Colleges began on the Eastern Shore. In the year 1782, representatives of Kent County presented a petition to the Legislature, saying that they had a flourishing school at Chestertown, their county seat, and wished to enlarge it into a college. The General Assembly not only authorized the establishment of Washington College, which still exists, but, in consideration of the fact that large sums of money had been subscribed for the institution by public spirited citizens of the Eastern Shore, resolved that "such exertions for the public good merited the approbation of the legislature and ought to receive public encouragement and assistance." These are the very words of representatives of Maryland more than a century ago. Their deeds were even better than their words. They voted that £1,250 a year should be paid from the public treasury for the support of Washington College. That vote was passed just after the conclusion of a long war with England, when the State and indeed the whole country lay impoverished. Towards raising this government subsidy for higher education, the legislature granted all public receipts from marriage licenses, from liquor licenses, fines for breaking the Sabbath, and all similar fines and licenses that were likely to be constant sources of revenue.

The founding of St. John's College occurred two years later, in 1784. This act by the State of Maryland was also in response to a local demand. It was urged by the citizens of Annapolis that King William's School, although a classical institution, was inadequate to meet the educational demands of the age. It was very properly added that the West Shore, as well as the Eastern, deserved to have a college; and so St. John's was established as the counterpoise of Washington College. The legislative act is almost identical with that establishing the earlier institution, although the appropriation was larger. The legislature gave St. John's four acres

of good land for college grounds and building sites and an annual appropriation of £1,750 current money. This sum, in the words of the original act, was to "be annually and forever hereafter given and granted as a donation by the public to the use of said college on the Western Shore, to be applied by the visitors and governors of the said college for the payment of salaries to the principal professors and tutors of said college." The establishment was to be absolutely unsectarian. Students of any denomination were to be admitted without religious or civil tests. Not even compulsory attendance upon college prayers was required; so modern were the legislative fathers of Maryland.

The next step in the higher educational history of Maryland was the federation of the two colleges into the University of Maryland. The two boards of visitors and two representatives of each faculty constituted the University Convocation, presided over at Annapolis on commencement day by the Governor of the State, who was *ex officio* chancellor of the University. One of the college presidents acted as vice-chancellor. Thus more than a century ago Maryland inaugurated a State system of higher education which, if it had been sustained, would have given unity and vigor to her academic life. But unfortunately, in 1794, the legislature yielded to county prejudices and withdrew £500 from the £1,250 annually granted to Washington College and began to establish a fund, the income of which was distributed among various county academies on both shores of the Chesapeake. This was the origin of the subsidies still given in one form or another to secondary institutions in the State of Maryland. In 1805 the remaining appropriation of £750 belonging to Washington College and the entire £1,750 hitherto granted to St. John's College were withheld for the avowed purpose of "disseminating learning in the different counties of the State."

For six years there was famine in the land as regards the support of higher education. At last in 1811 the legislature resumed appropriations to St. John's College. Realizing that it had misappropriated to local uses subsidies "granted annually forever" to St. John's, the legislature endeavored for many years to compromise by giving a smaller allowance. The Court of Appeals ultimately decided in 1859 that such a readjustment was a breach of contract and that the College could collect what was due it from the State. There is perhaps some excuse for the economy of Maryland in its treatment of St. John's College, namely "hard times." A State that went through the financial crises of 1837 and 1857 without repudiation deserves some historical credit. St. John's College was suspended during the civil war, but appropriations were renewed in 1866 and have been continued, with slight variations, down to the present day. The amount granted in 1888 was \$3,000 for the institution itself and \$5,200 for boarding twenty-five students, one from each senatorial district.

The first University of Maryland ceased to exist by the act of 1805, which withheld appropriations from St. John's College; but in the year

1812 a new University of Maryland was instituted by authority of the State, in the City of Baltimore. The proceeds of a State Lottery were granted to the institution, for a library, scientific apparatus, botanical garden, etc. The corporation was to have the full equipment of four faculties, representing the arts, law, medicine and theology. Two faculties of law and medicine still perpetuate the spirit of the founders of the University of Maryland, and are honorable and distinguished promoters of professional education. It cannot be said that they were ever treated with adequate generosity, though they actually received from State Lotteries between \$30,000 and \$40,000, and were never taxed.

The present generation has not been so generous to the cause of higher education as were the Fathers of the State, but nevertheless, Maryland in her entire history, has appropriated something over \$650,000 for what may be strictly called college education, not counting \$60,000 given to the State Agricultural College, nor \$40,000 proceeding from State Lotteries. While this collective bounty is small, it is money given by voluntary taxation and not taken from institutions of learning. Most of the amount was raised in times when the State was poor or heavily in debt, and when public money came with difficulty. Moreover this financial generosity of Maryland establishes the principle for which we are contending, namely that this State, like all other enlightened States in the world, has recognized the duty of support to higher and unsectarian institutions of learning. She has at different times appropriated \$650,000 to colleges and the University of Maryland from her public treasury.

Let us now inquire what other States in the American Union have done for higher education, always recognizing of course great inequality in State population and in the taxable basis.

Virginia, whose earliest educational foundations Maryland helped to lay by her tobacco-tax, has expended upon colleges and university over two millions dollars, during her history as a State, not counting the colonial bounty to William and Mary. Since the war Virginia has given her University \$40,000 a year. Before the war, she gave \$15,000 a year. The original university-establishment cost the State about \$400,000. The people of Virginia are proud of their University, and it would be suicide for any political party to cut off the yearly appropriation from the institution founded by Thomas Jefferson. The State of South Carolina was Jefferson's model for generous appropriations to the cause of sound learning. She has given two million and eight hundred thousand dollars to that object. Georgia has given \$938,000 for the same purpose. Louisiana has given \$794,000 from her State treasury for the higher education in recent years and, according to the testimony of her own authorities, has distributed over two millions among schools, academies, and colleges. Texas has spent upon college education \$382,000, and has given for higher education two and one-quarter million acres of land. The educational foundations, both academic and popular, in the Lone Star State, are among the richest in America.

Turning now to the Great West, we find that Michigan has given over two million dollars to higher education. She supports a University which is as conspicuous in the Northwest as the University of Virginia is in the South, upon one-twentieth of a mill tax on every dollar of taxable property in the State. That means half a cent on every hundred dollars. This University tax-rate yielded last year \$47,272. Would the people of Maryland give one-tenth of a mill tax, or a cent on every hundred dollars of their taxable property, to strengthen this University? One-tenth of a mill tax on the present taxable basis of Maryland, which is \$486,000,000, would yield \$48,000 a year. Wisconsin pays one-eighth of a mill tax for her University, and that yields \$74,000 per annum. Wisconsin has given for higher education \$1,200,000. Nebraska is even more generous to her State University. She grants three-eighths of a mill tax, yielding about \$60,000 a year. The State of California grants one-tenth of a mill tax, which yielded last year over \$76,000. Besides this, the University of California has a permanent state endowment of \$811,000, yielding an annual income of \$52,000, making a total of \$128,000 which the State gives annually to its highest institution of learning. Altogether California has expended upon higher education two and one-half million dollars.

It is needless to give further illustrations of State aid to American universities. These statistics have been carefully collected from original documents by one of our historical students, who are making important contributions to American educational history, to be published by the United States Bureau of Education. The principle of State aid to at least one leading university in each commonwealth is established in every one of the Southern and Western States. In New England, Harvard and Yale and other higher institutions of learning appear now to flourish upon individual endowments and private philanthropy; but almost every one of these collegiate institutions, at one time or another, has received State aid. Harvard was really a State institution. She inherited only £800, and 320 books from John Harvard. She was brought up in the arms of her Massachusetts nurse, with the bottle always in her mouth. The towns were taxed in her interest, and every family paid its peck of corn to make, as it were, hoecake for President Dunster and his faculty. Harvard College has had more than half a million dollars from the public treasury of Massachusetts. Yale has had about \$200,000 from the State of Connecticut. While undoubtedly the most generous gifts have come to New England colleges from private sources, yet every one of them, in time of emergency, has come boldly before representatives of the people and stated the want. They have always obtained State aid when it was needed. Last year the Massachusetts Institute of Technology became somewhat embarrassed financially, and asked the legislature for \$100,000. The institution got \$200,000, twice what it asked for, upon conditions that were easy to meet.

Can the State of Maryland and the friends of the Johns Hopkins ignore the abundant testimony in favor of the encouragement of university educa-

tion, not only by exemption from burdensome taxation, but by positive appropriations? If occasion arises, it will be proper and legitimate for the friends of this institution to go before the people of Maryland and say what is needed. *Private philanthropy will do all it can*, but public interest demands that the State should do its part by throwing off needless taxes and settling for what it has already taken away. Will the State be thus obliging? Of course not, unless public opinion and the Baltimore delegation to Annapolis become our champions. How shall we influence public opinion and taxpayers? Tell the facts and publish them.

There are at the present time, in round numbers, 200 students from Maryland studying at the Johns Hopkins University. Supposing all those boys should go to Princeton, or Yale, or Harvard, and stay a year, at their father's expense? I suppose that \$700 a year would be considered a very modest allowance at any one of these three institutions. Multiply \$700 by 200, and you have the sum of \$140,000 a year, which Maryland fathers *might* expend either in New Jersey, Massachusetts, or Connecticut. The chances are they would not escape so cheaply. I suppose it is an underestimate to say that fully one-half the above sum is annually saved to Maryland fathers by educating their boys here in Baltimore at the Johns Hopkins University.

Consider another striking fact. There are 200 Hopkins students from other States now living in Baltimore. It is a very reasonable estimate to say that these students expend, on the average, \$500 a year in this city. Living is certainly cheaper here than in many northern colleges, and vastly cheaper than at German universities. A Baltimore father now allows his son, who is a graduate of the Johns Hopkins University, \$1,000 a year in Germany. Allow \$500 annual expenditure by every student who comes to the Johns Hopkins from a distance. Multiply \$500 by 200 and you have \$100,000 a year brought to our city by these outsiders. There are now 57 men upon our university faculty. It would not be surprising if most of them spent most of their salaries in this pleasant town of Baltimore. The university pays out \$100,000 a year to its entire staff of instructors. A somewhat careful computation has been made, based upon the known extravagance or reputed parsimony of every member of the faculty, and the result has been reached that at least \$80,000 of this sum is paid back into Baltimore hands for the current expenses of professorial life. Twenty thousand dollars are paid by the university to our fellows and scholars. It is safe to say that every cent of that money is spent in Baltimore. The university gives more than enough free tuition to balance any present charges upon the fellows and scholars. Besides all this, and counting out expenditures for books and apparatus ordered from a distance, the university pays at least \$30,000 a year for current local expenses, for coal and gas, for printing our numerous journals, for wages and office expenses. Add up these various items and you will find that the local expenditure by the university and its various members, plus the \$70,000

spent and the \$70,000 saved by Baltimore fathers in educating their sons at home, amounts to \$370,000 a year. Reflect now for a moment that this institution has been in operation for 13 years. Allowing for fewer students and fewer professors and less general expenditure in earlier years, we should be safe in saying that the Johns Hopkins University has caused no less than its original endowment of three and one-half million to be poured into the lap of Baltimore, if we include the taxes we have paid and the cost of our university buildings, laboratories, &c., a local investment, now valued at nearly a million dollars. All this has served to beautify and improve this city, to give instruction to its youth, pleasure and profit to its citizens, and labor to its workingmen. How many families have been attracted to Baltimore for permanent residence by the possibility of giving their sons a good university education? What does a family of culture and fortune expend yearly in this city? My friends, if you will review the whole matter, pencil in hand, after you return home, you will find the estimate of three and a half million dollars local expenditure already caused, directly or indirectly in Baltimore, by this university, a very modest estimate.

It is a painful duty to suggest any measurement of the worth of a great university to a great city by the standard of dollars and cents. We all know in our hearts that there are moral, educational, and scientific values beyond all estimate,—products of character, culture, and research that can be neither bought nor sold. But we must sometimes appeal to heads as well as to hearts.

Will any Baltimore tax-payer dispute the economic significance of three and a half million dollars expended in thirteen years in this city? Will Baltimore offer exemption to the Belt for eleven years and tax its own university for ever and ever? Will the City Council offer premiums and exemptions to *foreign* capital for investment here in manufactures or in material industries, and impose a tax upon *home* property used for the education of Maryland youth, upon a business, if you please, which brings at least \$400,000 per annum into Baltimore circulation? These are considerations which the tax-payers and representatives of Baltimore would not utterly disregard, if properly presented and clearly understood. The Baltimore delegation would willingly champion the Hopkins cause before the Legislature, if public opinion and the city press should take our side. The good will of the counties could be enlisted by the same policy as that pursued by all universities that have sought public aid. A free scholarship to the best candidate from every senatorial district of Maryland as determined by a competitive examination set by university authority, would solve the local problem and thus bring higher education into organic connection with the educational system of the state.

Do you say that all this would lead to meddlesome interference by the politicians? That is what everybody said when a university was founded by the Prussian government in Berlin. That is the stock argument against

all state universities. But there stand to-day Berlin and all the German universities firm and untroubled upon state foundations. The whole South and the entire West are full of educational establishments by the state. Some of them, like the Universities of Virginia, Michigan, and Wisconsin, are beacon lights of intelligent and non-partisan administration. Have Washington politicians done any harm to the Smithsonian Institution? On the contrary, they have indirectly increased its economic power by appropriations amounting to nearly two million dollars. They allow the Secretary of the Smithsonian to direct the expenditure of \$220,000 a year. Congress allows the Smithsonian to be managed by a Board of Regents composed of distinguished college presidents and public men of spotless integrity. Amid all the changes in the Civil Service, no man has ever been displaced for political reasons from either the Smithsonian Institution or the National Museum. These facts are stated upon good authority. Are, then, Washington politicians a superior order of beings? Not as far as reported in the newspapers or the Congressional Record.

There was once a seven years' famine in Egypt, but there were previously seven years of great plenty throughout all the land and much corn was stored up for food in the cities during Joseph's administration. Baltimore, Maryland, and the Johns Hopkins had a longer period of plenty before the lean kine began to come up out of the Potomac. Let us hope that there is corn enough in the store-houses of Baltimore City, and in the corn-belt beyond the Ohio, to make all the lean-fleshed kine once more fat and well favored. In any case Baltimore, Maryland, and this university are all struggling with the same circumstances. As Benjamin Franklin observed about the time Charles Carroll of Carrollton signed the Declaration of Independence, "Let us all hang together, or we shall all hang separately."

What are the serious thoughts that have been emphasized in this address upon "The Encouragement of Higher Education?"

1. The Johns Hopkins is now a truly National University upon Local and Individual Foundations.

2. This noble institution which benefits Baltimore, Maryland, and the whole country especially the South and West can be strengthened most efficiently by further Local and Individual Endowments.

3. The examples of history at home as well as abroad show that states encourage universities by wise exemption from burdensome taxation and by generous appropriations, if original endowments and private philanthropy prove inadequate.

4. The development of public opinion, based upon a knowledge of present facts and upon existing relations of this university to Baltimore and Maryland, is the best way to encourage Higher Education *in this city, in this state, and in this country.*

PUBLISHER'S NOTICE.

Single copies of these "Notes," will be sold at 5 cents. 25 copies will be furnished for \$1.00. Subscribers to the *Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science* (price \$3.00 for twelve numbers) will receive the "Notes" gratis.

1. **Municipal Government in England**, a report of an interview with Albert Shaw, Ph. D., was issued in January, 1889.
2. **Social Work in Australia and London**, notes of a talk by William Grey of London, was issued in February, 1889.

A detailed prospectus of the "*Studies*" will be sent on application. The following numbers are now ready :

- I. **Arnold Toynbee**. By F. C. MONTAGUE, Fellow of Oriel College. With an Account of the Work of Toynbee Hall in East London, by PHILIP LYTTTELTON GELL, M. A., Chairman of the Council. Also an Account of the Neighborhood Guild in New York, by CHARLES B. STOVER, A. B. 50 cents. *Ready*.
- II-III. **The Establishment of Municipal Government in San Francisco**. By BERNARD MOSES, Ph. D., Professor of History and Politics in the University of California. 50 cents. *Ready*.
- IV. **The City Government of New Orleans**. By JUDGE WILLIAM W. HOWE. 25 cents. *Ready*.
- V-VI. **English Culture in Virginia**. The Jefferson-Gilmer Letters. By Professor WILLIAM P. TRENT, of the University of the South. 50 cents. *In press*.
- VII-VIII. **The River Towns of Connecticut**. A Study of Wethersfield, Hartford, and Windsor. By CHARLES M. ANDREWS, Fellow in History, J. H. U. 50 cents. *In press*.

The following comprise the six annual series of the *Studies* and the extra volumes.

SERIES I.—Local Institutions. 479 pp. \$4.00.

SERIES II.—Institutions and Economics. 629 pp. \$4.00.

SERIES III.—Maryland, Virginia, and Washington. 595 pp. \$4.00.

SERIES IV.—Municipal Government and Land Tenure. 600 pp. \$3.50.

SERIES V.—Municipal Government, History and Politics. 559 pp. \$3.50.

SERIES VI.—The History of Co-operation in the United States. 540 pp. \$3.50.

EXTRA VOLUME ONE.—The Republic of New Haven. 342 pp. \$2.00.

EXTRA VOLUME TWO.—Philadelphia, 1681-1887. 444 pp. \$3.00.

EXTRA VOLUME THREE.—Baltimore and the 19th of April, 1861. 176 pp. \$1.00.

EXTRA VOLUMES FOUR AND FIVE.—Local Constitutional History of United States. (*In press*.)

A complete set of the six series bound uniformly in an attractive library edition, can now be had for \$18; with the extra volumes, "New Haven," "Baltimore," and "Philadelphia," altogether nine volumes, \$22; with the current series, \$25.

Address all orders to the PUBLICATION AGENCY, JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY, BALTIMORE, MD.

No. 3, March, 1889.

JOHN MURPHY & CO., PRINTERS, BALTIMORE.

RETURN TO the circulation desk of any
University of California Library
or to the

NORTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
Bldg. 400, Richmond Field Station
University of California
Richmond, CA 94804-4698

ALL BOOKS MAY BE RECALLED AFTER 7 DAYS

- 2-month loans may be renewed by calling (510) 642-6753
- 1-year loans may be recharged by bringing books to NRLF
- Renewals and recharges may be made 4 days prior to due date.

DUE AS STAMPED BELOW

JUN 0 2003
FEB 14 2002

JAN 0 2002

JUN 0 2003

JUL 0 8 2004

12,000 (11/95)

FORM NO. DD6
50M 5-03

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY
Berkeley, California 94720-6000

GENERAL LIBRARY - U.C. BERKELEY

8000564320